

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office Action mailed May 10, 2004. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1-58 remain pending in this application. Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing out that the application contains allowable subject matter, and reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Claim Amendments

The Office Action objected to claims 1-12, 14-18 and 30-47 on the basis of informalities. Claims 1-12, 14-18 and 30-47 have been amended and it is believed that the Examiner's objections have been accommodated. Applicants wish to clarify that the foregoing amendments have been made for purely cosmetic purposes, and not in response to rejections based on prior art. Therefore, no prosecution history estoppel arises from these amendments.

With respect to claim 3, the action further objected "In claim 3, line 2, delete 'transceivers is ---' and insert 'transceivers are ---.'" Applicants respectfully submit that the verb "is" modifies the singular "plurality" and not the plural "transceivers," thus Applicants believe this portion of the claim, as originally presented, is correct and free from objectionable informalities.

The Office Action rejected claims 2-12, 17-29, 31, 36, and 46-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. With respect to these rejections Applicants have appropriately amended the claims to place them in condition for allowance.

Applicants submit that the amendments made to accommodate the Examiner’s rejections do not further limit the claims, and are not being added to overcome a rejection based on any prior art reference. Rather, the amendments have been made for purposes of more clearly defining the invention. Therefore, no prosecution history estoppel arises from these amendments.

II. Additional drawings are not necessary for the understanding of the subject matter sought to be patented.

The Office Action objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), which states that a drawing, when furnished, must depict every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The action specifically objects that drawings must be furnished for “the central office interface and plurality of DSL transceivers data transmission links, including all the elements recited in claims 30-58.” Applicants respectfully submit that such those features are explicitly shown in FIG. 5, and labeled 30a through 30x. Applicants direct the Examiner’s attention to page 26 of the specification, lines 3-6, which state that “the configurations introduced with regard to FIGS. 5 & 6 above illustrating the combination of multiple DSL transceivers 210 to increase the data rate or extend the reach of a multi-channel DSL communications link 200’ may be applied at a CO 10.”

Applicants submit that all elements in claims 30 through 58, which are amenable to drawing representations, are provided in the pending drawings. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

III. Prior Art Made of Record

The prior art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are now in proper condition for allowance, and respectfully request that the Examiner pass this case to issuance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel R. McClure
Registration No. 38,962

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500